

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: August 29, 2000
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of August 24, 2000

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Darrell Alder	City of Washougal Council Member (P)
Jack Burkman	City of Vancouver Council Member (P)
Jay Cerveny	City of La Center Council Member (P)
Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor (P)
Bill Ganley	City of Battle Ground Mayor
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member (A)
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member (P)
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

(P) Primary (A) Alternate

Public:

Marnie Allen	Clark County Schools
Dean Baker	The Columbian
Mary Byrne	RSD122
Foster Church	The Oregonian
Steve Dearborn	Miller/Nash
Ron Gullickson	Battle Ground School District
Ken Hadley	CCAR
Tom Jacobs	Cascade SE Neighborhood Association
Dax Logsdon	ESD112
Douglas Mc Cudden	ESD112/Camas Schools
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
George Vartanian	Self
Scott Walstra	SWCA

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Eric Eisemann	Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Gordon Euler	Clark County Long Range Planning
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Holmes	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	Clark County Long Range Planning
Oliver Orjiako	Clark County Long Range Planning
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Manager
Brian Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
John Tyler	Clark County ESA Program
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development
Phil Wuest	Clark County Long Range Planning

Introductions / Roll Call

Called to order at 4:00 PM by Commissioner Craig Pridemore. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.

Approve August 10 Steering Committee Notes

No corrections. Notes accepted as published.

Review 81-19 urban/rural residential growth ration policy

Commissioner Pridemore says that Commissioner Morris has requested this agenda item be moved. It will be moved to next agenda.

Public Involvement Update – Potential agenda for Sept. 16 public assembly

Pat Lee and Leanne Forney present. Public meetings were completed yesterday (August 23). The County Assembly is the next step. Leanne Forney says Gene Lawson will be at meeting on September 14th to talk about the County Assembly. A mailer is going out in mail this week. The Assembly is to present key issues from the

Steering Committee. It might be appropriate for Steering Committee members to be present at the Assembly. Any presentations should be neutral. The question is if members what to be present. The date is September 16th. Committee members can also be in small groups if desired. The presentation is to describe the issues and talk about the trade-offs etc., not the positions of the jurisdictions. Commissioner Stanton asks who prepares the presentation. Leanne Forney says it should not be scripted, but neutral and hit on key concerns. Jack Burkman and Jeanne Harris volunteer. Leanne Forney will contact committee members individually. The event starts at 8:30 and probably over by 10:30. Dean Dossett is also willing to do it.

Commissioner Pridemore asks if the mailing is producing questions. Only a few questions to date. Most people do not have the fliers yet.

SB 6094 Buildable Lands/Density Review

Oliver Orjiako summarized Policy Paper #6. **The Board recently adopted the county wide planning policies** necessary to impliment SB 6094. SB 6094 is specific to looking at densities and the regional plan. The report to the state on SB 6094 is due September 2002. The bill calls for actual densities that went into the assumptions. It looks at consistency between assumptions and the actual numbers. Pages 4 - 5 in the Policy Paper show options and possible implications. Staff strongly recommends option 1 – folding review and update into the same timeline. It seems appropriate to complete the requirements for SB6094 this year so that the plan report is also available for review at the same time. Staff is asking the Steering Committee to “adopt” option number 1.

Commissioner Pridemore asks if there are other options. Oliver Orjiako points out the options in the Policy Paper. Jeanne Harris asks about the buildable lands and the Plan Monitoring Report. Oliver Orjiako responds that buildable lands inventory and Monitoring Report are similar. There is a need to determine if we are meeting the density requirements. Pat Lee says that additional data gathering is necessary for SB 6094 to fold it into the Plan update beyond the Monitoring Report. Brian Snodgrass says it is additional work, but it is doable by looking at Tidemark and Sierra. The data gathering can be used to check and refine existing data. Pat Lee says the downside is additional staff effort. Commissioner Pridemore says if a UGB is moved then SB 6094 needs to be complied with. Because it is not likely the UGB is to be moved, do we need to make the decision. Oliver Orjiako says there is not a direct answer. There will still be additional work to do for the Committee.

Dean Dossett says that no one is in compliance with the 60/40 goal – some jurisdictions are over and some under the target. The discussion has been whether or not to comply with 60/40. Does this undercut that discussion? Oliver Orjiako responds that SB 6094 will not be reviewed again until 2006. Oliver Orjiako says that what Dean Dossett says is true, but you must look at the methodology of collecting data. If we are not meeting 6/16 what are the other alternatives? That is what is being looked at by collecting this data. Do we have sufficient land is one of the questions that the data can answer. Dean Dossett says that the original intent must reflect the policies adopted.

Commissioner Pridemore asks if the analysis is deeper than the Plan Monitoring Report. Oliver Orjiako says they are similar, but SB6094 looks more closely at what land has been used. The modeling can be set up in different ways. The Monitoring Report looked at what is now on the ground, but only those that are already build. Commissioner Pridemore asks why this was not in the Plan Monitoring Report. Did this not have anything to do with the expansion of UGBs. Oliver Orjiako says this will go more toward meeting SB 6094. The Plan Monitoring Report does not address employment. Jeanne Harris asks if SB 6094 is an enhancement of the Plan Monitoring Report. SB 6094 is adding a little bit more work. Marty Snell says the Plan Monitoring Report is a general look. SB 6094 looks at specific plats, infrastructure, etc. Commissioner Pridemore asks if the struggles to decide what to put into the Plan Monitoring Report were irrelevant. Pat Lee says SB 6094 is an enhancement. Monitoring is poor in looking at actual density. Commissioner Pridemore asks if this was in the original plan. Oliver Orjiako answers that it can be enhanced in the same time period. Commissioner Pridemore says the Committee doesn't make decision. The County Commissioners need to decide.

Marty Snell says Camas is committing staff to the data gathering. Dean Dossett says he was expecting this in the Plan Monitoring Report. He is frustrated that it is a time consuming process. Oliver Orjiako says that most of the work is already done, but there needs to be more detail. Dean Dossett asks if the Plan Monitoring Report says a specific number, what is the level of magnitude change that could be expected from the new data collected. Pat Lee says it will focus on the density. If there was a desire to move the UGB this would need to be demonstrated. Jack Burkman asks if the detail is needed to move the boundaries. Is the new detail likely change the outcome? Pat Lee says that population allocation will be affected by the additional work. Commissioner Pridemore asks when the SB 6094 data could be ready. Pat Lee says it can be ready by the end of the year. He does not expect a significant change from the current numbers. The population question is core to the review.

Commissioner Pridemore asks why this is coming up now? Oliver Orjiako reiterates that SB 6094 is not due until 2002 and the Update is due in 2001. This timeline discrepancy raises a potential of legal challenge that SB 6094 is not being met unless it is implemented in conjunction with the adoption of the revised comprehensive plan. Jack Burkman says this will cost more money. Brian Snodgrass says it is affordable, and will need some new info. The density issue work is very doable. Dean Dossett asks if there is an option. Will it hamper the Steering Committee to not do it? Rich Carson says this is anticipated in the timeline and will not hamper the Committee. Jack Burkman is still uncomfortable, it is more a matter of timing. He wants to talk to staff more. Jeanne Harris wants benchmarks for the future so we do not have to redo work. Dean Dossett thinks it should take less priority if it will slow us down.

Commissioner Pridemore says we need the information. Commissioner Pridemore says we are going to go with the option to meet SB6094 data requirements and keep the Committee apprised of timing and progress.

ESA/Environmental Issues – Discussion

John Tyler presents information about possible pending environmental legislation or mandates. He talks about how this will affect the Committee. He presents an overview of the County's response to ESA. We are responding to the federal listing. Clark County has submitted to NMFS how the County will respond with regulations, programs and ordinances. How do we need to change and move forward, such as modifying regulations. The program identifies the 12 critical areas and tries to reduce 3rd party lawsuits.

The program is in two phases. Two years to assess. Five years from now work will be completed to be in compliance. Jay Cerveny asks if the County is doing the work and others will adopt. Tyler responds it is in partnership. The plan looks at County issues first.

School Siting Issues

Marnie Allen begins that there has been significant debate on this issue. Policy Paper #9 presents options and preferences. There are many factors to look at before schools can move outside of the UGAs. Current policy allows schools to look outside boundaries if specific criteria are met. Schools advocate keeping the current policy. TAC has presented three options as outlined in Policy Paper #9.

Dale Miller adds other jurisdictional assumptions and what needs to be modified in the assumptions of the Comprehensive Plan. Schools are infrastructure, but they are also an activity and have impacts on other infrastructure, particularly on roads. Also, what kind of an impact does location of the school have on the shape of growth around it. There needs to be a balance between planning and getting the most efficient use for a school's dollars spent. Siting of schools is difficult. Dale Miller states that he advocates taking out some of the ambiguity in the Comp Plan.

Marnie Allen uses a map to show school district boundaries to demonstrate districts are not synonymous with UGAs.

John Idsinga says the BG school district is a tough example. They need flexibility to cut on transportation from North County students. To tighten the criteria up for siting school outside of the UGBs he feels is not a good idea. Bill Ganley says there is a 4 to 1 balance in Battle Ground from County to Battle Ground students. There are severe traffic problems.

Jack Burkman suggests that tightening the requirements might be a good approach because schools can act as a magnet for development. Commissioner Pridemore asks if all of the other types of districts (fire, sewer, etc.) should be extended the same deference in the Comp Plan. Dean Dossett says you can only fit so much into the UGB. There needs to be flexibility to fit it all in. Commissioner Pridemore questions the infrastructure requirements that are necessary to support this development. Jay

Cerveney says they do not have the problems that Battle Ground has. Bill Ganley says Battle Ground services the rural areas. Dean Dossett points out the Camas example and that development is already happening there.

Commissioner Stanton asks what is wrong with option #2. Marnie Allen responds that it would limit schools to Urban Reserve and inside the UGB if they serve urban students. Dale Miller says that a small UGB would allow schools to go through an assessment to locate outside of the UGB. He says that new schools will not eliminate the traffic problems in Battle Ground. The policy is to get the most efficiency out of infrastructure. Commissioner Pridemore uses Ridgefield as an example. Marnie Allen says that they are still looking for land and hitting some problems in finding a suitable location. Commissioner Pridemore states that buying land outside the UGB will be cheaper. Dean Dossett says Camas has two sites and the elementary is inside and high school is outside of the UGB. Marty Snell says schools looked and choose to locate outside of the UGB. Commissioner Pridemore asks about the size requirement for a school site. Forty acres is the answer. Commissioner Pridemore says that eventually we will run out of land. So we restrict development outside of the UGB now or it will result in sprawl. Eventually schools will have to make efficient use of the land, as will all other uses. We can do it today, or in the future. Commissioner Stanton says some districts are now addressing this. Jeanne Harris asks if the bar should be set a little higher than it is set now. Cost is a large factor. John Idsinga says schools need to be more innovative. Eric Holmes says that schools are in response to new development. It begs the question of putting rural population in rural schools.

Jack Burkman sees option 2 not as a prohibition. Dale Miller says that is correct and it allows flexibility in the rural areas. Commissioner Stanton says that the options need to be clarified in the Policy Paper. Marnie Allen says that the districts need flexibility. Commissioner Pridemore, as devils advocate, says that the County might try to redirect the schools to other land and that schools do not want the priorities to exist. Marnie Allen says the research to find buildable land inside of UGBs by the schools is not always acknowledged by County staff.

Brian Snodgrass says that **there might be some guidance added into the policy to direct future boards.**

Commissioner Pridemore sends this to the TAC for further clarification and review and indicated that the responses should come to the Board and not back through the Steering Committee.

Technical Advisory Committee Update

Phil Wuest updates the Committee on population parameters. The paper is being worked on currently with low, medium and high options. TAC is also working on initial employment forecast. Scott **Bailey** from the Bureau of Economic Analysis will look at this. They will begin looking at allocation of employment to population and allocate by

historic growth and buildable land. Information will also be provided on the implications of the different assumption choices.

Commissioner Pridemore says that population and employment is a policy issue. Phil Wuest says they will bring forward what it looks like. Pat Lee says that the selection of the number is a policy question and staff will try to provide the facts to the SC to assist in the discussion. The paper will be out in September.

Wuest says numbers from OFM are to come out in the Fall of 2001 and may change the numbers which we are now working with. JeanneHarris asks how accurate the estimates were in 1994.

Commissioner Pridemore asks to bring the Steering Committee several policy options to redirect allocation if that is desired, particularly related to capital facilities.

Other

Dean Dossett asks about pulling items from agendas. Commissioner Pridemore says that we can try to work around people's schedules. Jack Burkman says the meetings are to inform the Commissioners.

Adjourned

The Steering Committee adjourned at 5:40 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - august 24 2000.doc